



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

HD

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,655	06/24/2003	Shigeki Nakahara	1247-0516P	1274
2292	7590	09/05/2007	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				NGUYEN, MADELEINE ANH VINH
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2625				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/05/2007		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/601,655 Examiner Madeleine AV Nguyen	NAKAHARA, SHIGEKI Art Unit 2625

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 23 August 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: see attachment. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

- 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
- 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
- 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
- 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: None.

Claim(s) objected to: None.

Claim(s) rejected: 15 and 16.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

- 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
- 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
- 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

- 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attachment.
- 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
- 13. Other: _____


Madeleine AV Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 2625

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 08/23/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant remarks that Shibata fails to identify an originating communication apparatus but only identifies the destination facsimile apparatus, which will perform the printing operation.

2. It is noted that Shibata discloses a facsimile device 110 which is connected to and controlled by a personal computer 100. The personal computer can use the facsimile device 110 as a fax modem for transmitting data information from the personal computer 100 to another remote destination facsimile. In addition, the personal computer can use the facsimile device 110 as a printer of the personal computer 100. Thus, when a new fax machine connected to the computer 100, the user inputs a telephone number to pre-register it for a printing function at the new fax machine (Fig.6). The pre-registered telephone number stored in the new fax machine is the identification information for the new fax machine to identify the computer 100 when it receive the same telephone number from the computer 100. Thus the telephone number is not for transmitting or receiving data information but it is for the fax machine 110 to identify that the computer 100 as the originating communication apparatus wants to use the fax machine 110 as its printer. In other words, the telephone number is a print function command (and not a telephone number of a fax machine or a destination terminal) and an identification signal identifying the computer 100, as the originating communication apparatus, which wants to use

the fax machine 110 as its printer for printing. Shibata clearly teaches in step 303 (Fig.5) the determination “whether the telephone number specified by the ATD command is a print function telephone number or not”. Shibata continues with, “When it is not a print function telephone number, the telephone number is dialed to originate a call through the telephone line 10 (step 304). In this case, however, since the telephone number is a print function telephone number, the process proceeds to step 305” (col. 5, lines 30-42). As stated in the rejection, it was a matter of well known in the prior art that the telephone number representing the printing function from the computer 100 is the identification signal for identifying the computer 100 as the originating communication apparatus which wants to use the fax machine 110 as its printer for printing transferred data from the computer 100 to the fax machine 110. Ozeki reference only supports that well known in the prior art. The same above remark with Ritzerfeld reference. As stated in the rejection, it was commonly known in the art that the plurality of copies of the entire document could be grouped into a plurality of different groups and bundled each group of copies one by one since Shibata also teaches, “an original of one sheet or an original of a plurality of sheets is printed out in a plurality of copies (sort copy or group copy).” (Abstract) and “S: Print out an original of a plurality of sheets in a plurality of copies while specifying a sort copy. G: Print out an original of a plurality of sheets in a plurality of copies while specifying a group copy.” (col. 4, line 66 – col. 5, line 2).

3. In response to applicant's argument of the combination of Ozeki or Ritzerfeld reference, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined

teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

4. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

5. Last, in response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Ozeki and Ritzerfeld references are used to support the well known in the prior art taught in Shibata.

Conclusion

6. The final rejection of the claims is maintained.
7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Madeleine AV Nguyen whose telephone number is 571 272-7466. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L. Coles can be reached on 571 272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Madeleine AV Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2625

August 29, 2007